UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,734	02/09/2004	Wataru Ishikawa	KOY-17	9212
20311	7590 08/15/2007	EXAM	EXAMINER	
LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP 475 PARK AVENUE SOUTH			MARTIN, LAURA E	
15TH FLOOR NEW YORK,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TIEW TOTAL,			2853	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		•		~			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/774,734	ISHIKAWA, WATARU				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Laura E. Martin	2853				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period varieto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO accuse the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Ju	<u>uly 2007</u> .					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	- ' '						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims	·					
4) 🖾	Claim(s) <u>1,2,4,5 and 7-16</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
•	Claim(s) <u>1,2,4,5 and 7-16</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
,	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)	1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received	•				
	2. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No.				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio						
	application from the International Bureau		-				
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies no	t received.				
Attachmer							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) D Notice of	Informal Patent Application				
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) [_] Other:	 ·				

Application/Control Number: 10/774,734

Art Unit: 2853

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chatterjee et al. (US 5985984) in view of Noguchi et al. (US 20020065335).

Chatterjee et al. discloses the following claim limitations:

As per claims 1 and 4: a light curable aqueous resin composition (column 1, lines 12-21 and column 2, lines 20-25) comprising a polymerizable compound, and an aqueous photopolymerization initiator which generates free radicals by active ray (column 7, lines 4-35) and a non-ionic surfactant (column 7, line 65-column 8, lines 23).

As per claims 11 and 12: the amount of an organic solvent being 0 to 5% (column 7, lines 48-55 – Chattergee et al. disclose that there may or may not be organic solvents within the ink; in example four, there amounts of an organic solvent smaller than 5%).

As per claims 13 and 14: the amount of an organic solvent being 0 to 3% (column 7, lines 48-55 — Chattergee et al. disclose that there may or may not be organic solvents within the ink; in example four, there amounts of an organic solvent smaller than 3%).

Art Unit: 2853

Chaterjee et al. does not disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claims 1 and 4: a polymerizable compound which polymerizes with radical polymerization by water and active ray.

As per claims 7 and 9: jetting onto an unabsorbant recording material.

As per claims 8 and 10: jetting onto an absorbent recording material.

Noguchi et al. discloses the following claim limitations:

As per claims 1 and 4: a polymerizable compound which polymerizes with radical polymerization by water and active ray [0002] and [0027].

As per claims 7 and 9: jetting onto an unabsorbant recording material [0012].

As per claims 8 and 10: jetting onto an absorbent recording material [0054].

As per claims 11 and 12: the amount of an organic solvent being 0 to 5% [0123].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the ink taught by Chaterjee et al. with the disclosure of Noguchi et al. in order to print with an ink jet printer high quality color images.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chatterjee et al. (US 5985984) and Noguchi et al. (US 20020065335) and further in view of Owatari et al. (US 6095645).

Chatterjee et al. and Noguchi et al. do not disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claims 2 and 5: a non-ionic surfactant is fluorine system surfactant comprising a perfluoroalkyl group in a molecule.

As per claims 3 and 6: the content of the non-ionic surfactant is 10 to 10000 ppm.

Art Unit: 2853

Owatari et al. discloses the following claim limitations:

As per claims 2 and 5: a non-ionic surfactant is fluorine system surfactant comprising a perfluoroalkyl group in a molecule (column 3, lines 64).

As per claims 3 and 6: the content of the non-ionic surfactant is 10 to 10000 ppm (column 4, line 7).

As per claims 15 and 16: the content of the non-ionic surfactant is 20 to 1000 ppm (column 4, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the ink taught by Chaterjee et al. as modified with the disclosure of Owatari et al. in order to provide a stable ink composition.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitations "active ray curable type aqueous ink, which is jetted from an ink jet printer onto a recording material by a recording head comprising nozzles which selectively control ejection of ink droplets, wherein:" and "an image forming method in which active ray curable type aqueous ink is cured by active ray is jetted from an ink jet printer onto a recording material by a recording head comprising nozzles which selectively control ejection of ink droplets, wherein:" have not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the

Application/Control Number: 10/774,734

Art Unit: 2853

process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

The body of the claim does not bring the ink jet printer, solely the ink, into the body of the claim, thus the ink jet printer claimed in the preamble has not been given weight. The examiner considers the preamble to ends at "comprising:" and suggests, that in order for the first claim to overcome the present rejection, it be written as:

"Active ray curable type aqueous ink comprising: a light curable type aqueous resin composition comprising a polymerizable compound which polymerizes with radical polymerization by water and active ray, an aqueous photo polymerization initiator which generates free radicals by active ray, and a non-ionic surfactant, wherein content of the non-ionic surfactant is i0 to i0,000 ppm, which is jetted onto a recording material by a recording head of an ink jet printer comprising nozzles which selectively controls control ejection of ink droplets, and is subsequently cured by irradiation of active ray."

As per the method claim (4), there are currently no method steps within the body of the claim.

As per the declaration dated June 20, 2007, the argument that the ink of Chatterjee is too viscous to be jetted onto a print media is still unconvincing, as the preamble is the only part of the claim in which the ink jet printer is mentioned. If the ink jet printer were claimed in the body of the claim, the present rejection would be overcome.

The applicant argues that it would have not been obvious to combine the teachings of Chattergee and Noguchi because the ink taught in Chattergee does not contain a substantial amount of water; however, the examiner disagrees. Chattergee discloses an amount of water within the ink, therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify this ink that includes water with another ink including water (such as that taught by Noguchi).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura E. Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-2160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/774,734 Page 7

Art Unit: 2853

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laura E. Martin

MANISH S. SHAH PRIMARY EXAMINER